

**REMARKS**

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

- I. Claims 13-16, 18-28 and 30-42 are pending in this application. In the May 03, 2007 final office action, the Examiner:
  - A. Rejected claims 13 and 25 under 35 USC 112 since the limitation "the status" lacks antecedent basis. In this regard, claims 13 and 25 have been amended.
  - B. Rejected claims 18 and 30 under 35 USC 112 since the limitation "the call type" lacks antecedent basis. In this regard, claims 18 and 30 have been amended.
  - C. Rejected claims 13-16, 18-28 and 30-42 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hunter et al. (USP 6,363,422).
  - D. The Examiner's Rejection of claims 13-16, 18-28 and 30-42 under 35 USC 102(a) should be withdrawn in light of the applicants' amended claims.

As noted above, the examiner has rejected claims 13-16, 18-28 and 30-42 in light of the Hunter reference. Fundamentally, independent claims 13 and 25 of the present invention require a system that is able to receive and output the status of service information at a building site. A review of the Hunter reference indicates that while this reference clearly discloses providing a user with operational data about a building control system, it mentions nothing about service related information, which is completely different information than operational data for a building control system, as applicant's own specification makes clear. See for example the description of Fig. 30 of the present invention which clearly distinguishes service related information for a building control system and operational data from a building control system.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Hunter reference fails to anticipate independent claims 13 and 25, and the final rejection should be withdrawn. Since dependent claims 14-16, 18-24, 26-28 and 30-42 incorporate each of the limitations of the independent claims, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of the dependent claims as well.

Further, the Hunter reference clearly fails to teach many of the limitations set forth in the dependent claims, the examiner's final rejection notwithstanding.

With respect to claims 15 and 27, applicant has claimed that service activity information further comprises information relating to the type of service activity being provided. In rejection claims 15 and 27, the examiner has relied upon column 6, lines 20-25 and column 5, lines 54-56. Looking at column 6, lines 20-25 this section of Hunter reads as follows: "In addition, when prompted to do so by the server, the client is able to pass appropriate control variables to its supported equipment, thereby commanding each apparatus to perform a particular temperature, turning on (or off) an HVAC apparatus, cascading through a set of security cameras, raising (or lowering) ambient light levels, and the like. All of the rules, termed vendor specific control codes (or control codes), for managing any particular piece of facilities equipment, are resident in the client system and are used by the client to monitor and control each of its supported pieces of apparatus." Accordingly, this section of Hunter merely describes the operational performance of a building control system, and how operational data is shared. It clearly does not teach providing information relating to the type of service activity being provided as claims 15 and 27 require. With respect to column 5, lines 54-56 this section of Hunter teaches "Operationally, each client system, in accord with the invention, is able to monitor and control one, or more, pieces of equipment." Here again, the Hunter reference merely recites well known operational performance of a building control system. It clearly fails to teach providing service related information, which, as discussed above, is clearly different from operational related information.

With respect to claims 17 and 29, the examiner has failed to address each of these dependent claims. It is applicant's position that since Hunter does not teach anything about providing service related information, it cannot teach providing information about the status of a service activity.

With respect to claims 18 and 30, it is the examiner's position that the concept of providing information about the call type of a service activity is shown in column 13, lines 40-52 and column 15, lines 35-56. With respect to column 13, lines 40-52, this paragraph relates to transmitting notification alerts, and is not relevant to the claimed limitation about providing information about the call type of a service activity. With respect to column 15, lines 35-56 this paragraph discusses how the system operates if an alarm condition is detected i.e. sound a security alert etc. It does not teach providing information about the call type of a service activity.

With respect to claims 19 and 31, it is the examiner's position that the concept of providing service information about a plurality of sites in which service activity is being performed is shown in column 3, lines 52-58. While the Hunter reference does disclose monitoring multiple facilities in column 3, line 25 for example, it clearly does not disclose providing service activity about a plurality of sites as claims 19 and 31 require.

With respect to claims 21 and 33, it is the examiner's position that the concept of requesting information about an individual service order, retrieving the service order information, and transmitting the service order information that was requested is shown in column 13 lines 10-16 and column 6, lines 18-31. A review of column 13, lines 10-16 reveals that this section of Hunter merely teaches providing a user with access to stored control and monitoring information, not information about service provided on the system, and certainly not orders for service as claims 21 and 33 require. With respect to column 13, lines 10-16, this section of Hunter merely teaches passing control variables, and does not teach anything about requesting or providing service order information.

With respect to claims 22 and 34, it is the examiner's position that transmitted service related information is organized by site is shown in column 13, lines 17-39. Firstly, the Hunter reference fails to teach providing service related information. Secondly, even if it could be argued that the Hunter reference teaches providing service related information i.e. maintenance performed on a system, it does not teach organizing such data by physical site. Similar arguments can be made with respect to claims 23, 24, 35 and 36.

In conclusion, with respect to each of the dependent claims discussed above, it is applicant's position that the Hunter reference does not teach or suggest any of the dependent claims discussed above, and that the examiner's rejection of each of the dependent claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicants have made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

*Michael J. Wallace*

Michael J. Wallace  
Registration No. 44,486  
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 28524  
SIEMENS CORPORATION  
Tel. No. (732) 321-3008